arXiv:2611.09887v1 [cs.LG] 6 Nov 2026

On the (non-)closedness of the set of ReLU networks

Eloi Martinet, Leon Bungert

November 9, 2026

Abstract

We prove that the set $\mathcal{N}_N$ of ReLU networks with one hidden layer and at most $N \in \mathbb{N}$ neurons is weakly closed in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, for a bounded connected open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Consequently, every coercive, weakly lower semicontinuous energy on this space attains its minimum over $\mathcal{N}_N$. This covers the Deep Ritz method with convex integrands, Sobolev training and Lipschitz learning. Moreover, as the weight decay parameter tends to zero, minimizers of the regularized problem converge, up to subsequences, to minimizers with minimal parameter norm. We also prove that the set of ReLU networks with two hidden layers of bounded widths is *not closed* in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ or in $C(\overline{\Omega})$. This disproves a conjecture of Petersen, Raslan and Voigtlaender.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Weak closedness of one-hidden-layer ReLU networks in Sobolev spaces **3**

3 Non-closedness for deeper networks **9**
3.1 Construction of the limit 11
3.2 Convergence of the sequence of neural networks 12
3.3 Non-representability of the limit 14

4 Applications **17**
4.1 The Deep Ritz method 18
4.2 Lipschitz learning 21
4.3 Selection of minimal-norm parameters via weight decay 22
4.4 Failure of existence for two hidden layers 23

5 Discussion **24**

1 Introduction

A given neural network architecture defines a family of functions parametrized by its weights and biases, which is referred to as the architecture's *realization set*. This set is not a vector space, and even its most basic topological property, closedness, is far from obvious: If networks of a fixed size converge in some function space, is the limit still a network of the same size?

This question goes back at least to [32], where the authors are interested in the existence of a *best approximation* from a set of neural network, namely the existence of a neural network u_θ of fixed size that minimizes $\|u_\theta - f\|$ where f is a target function and$\|.\|$ some function space norm.

The topology of realization sets was studied systematically by Petersen, Raslan and Voigtlaender [15]. Under broad assumptions on the activation, which include the ReLU, they show that the realization set of every fixed architecture is not closed in L^p for $1 < p < \infty$. In the uniform topology, non-closedness also occurs for most commonly used activations, whereas shallow networks with ReLU activation were shown to be closed in the uniform topology on $C([-B, B]^d)$, and so are deeper networks with bounded weights. Mahan, King and Cloninger [14] showed that, in general, closedness is false in Sobolev spaces: For activation functions which are m-times but not $m+1$-times continuously differentiable, networks of fixed architecture can converge in the $W^{(m-1),p}$ norms ($p \in [1, \infty]$) to functions outside the realization set. In all these constructions, the mechanism is the same. The high-level idea is that for a smooth activation σ,

$$n\big[\sigma(\,\cdot + 1/n) - \sigma(\,\cdot\,)\big] \longrightarrow \sigma',$$

so that two collapsing neurons approximate σ', which in general lies outside the realization set, while the parameters escape to infinity. For the ReLU $\sigma(t) := \max(t, 0)$, this collapse produces the Heaviside function $\mathbf{1}_{\{t>0\}}$. This explains the non-closedness in the L^p norm, but also why closedness can hold in stronger topologies. Note that a jump along a hyperplane is excluded by uniform convergence and, as we will see, by weak convergence in $W^{1,p}$.

The same exceptional behavior appears in the literature on optimal networks. Existence of best approximations is known for fixed-width Heaviside networks in L^p [28, 29], and for shallow ReLU networks with the mean-square loss, first in one dimension [10] and then in any dimension and for every width [6]. The latter proof enlarges the closure of the realization set by discontinuous generalized responses and shows that they cannot improve the optimal value. Similar results hold for residual [5] and sparse [7] ReLU networks. Generally speaking, it seems that ReLU networks enjoy closedness properties that smoother activations lack. However, all these results concern a single hidden layer, and closedness of deeper ReLU networks without parameter bounds was conjectured in [15].

Main contributions: (non-)closedness. This paper aims to clarify how far the closedness of ReLU networks extends in Sobolev spaces. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, open and connected, and let $\mathcal{N}_N$ be the set of shallow ReLU networks with at most N neurons on Ω. Our first main result, Theorem 2.3, states that if $(u^n)_n \subset \mathcal{N}_N$ converges in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ to some $u \in W^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$, then $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$. In particular, $\mathcal{N}_N$ is weakly closed in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for $p < \infty$, and weakly-$*$ closed in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. For $p \leq d$, this is not implied by any of the results above which concern L^p, the uniform topology, or smooth activations.

It turns out that this closedness is specific to shallow ReLU networks. Our second main result, Theorem 3.1, shows that for any bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, the set $\mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ of ReLU networks with two hidden layers of widths N and M is neither closed in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ nor, weakly or strongly, in any $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq p < \infty$. This answers negatively the question of closedness in the uniform topology for deeper ReLU networks. The mechanism of this counterexample is different from the collapse of neurons which produces a jump. Indeed, we construct a sequence whose limit f is still a ReLU network, however, of a larger size, in accordance with [13, 17, 22].

Applications. These results have immediate consequences for variational problems posed in Sobolev spaces. In the Deep Ritz method [23], the energy associated with a partial differential equation is minimized over a class of networks instead of the full energy space, see [9, 11, 19, 20] for its analysis. Sobolev training [24] and Lipschitz learning [12, 18, 21] follow the same principle, albeit with the aim of solving regression or classification problems. If the energy is coercive and weakly lower semicontinuous, a natural question is whether its restriction to a neural network class of fixed size attain its infimum. Note that coercivity of the energy

only controls the realized function sequence, not the parameters, a "coercivity gap" recently emphasized by Rezaei and Wojtowytsch [2] and Zuazua [4]; the latter showed that parameters of Gaussian networks may escape to infinity while the realized functions converge in H^1. However, using that minimizing sequences are bounded in $W^{1,p}$, the question of the existence of energy minimizers reduces to the weak closedness of the network class.

As a consequence of our closedness result Theorem 2.3, every coercive and weakly lower semicontinuous energy on $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $1 < p \leq \infty$, attains its infimum over $\mathcal{N}_N$ (Theorem 4.2), where for $p = \infty$ the weak-* topology has to be used. This covers the Deep Ritz method for convex integrands, Sobolev training and Lipschitz learning (the latter for $p = \infty$). The case $p = 1$ fails, since bounded sequences in $W^{1,1}$ are not weakly compact by the lack of a predual space. Since the same neural network function has many different parametrizations, we also show that vanishing weight decay selects an optimal network with parameters of minimal norm (Proposition 4.12). Furthermore, as a consequence of our non-closedness result for deeper networks Theorem 3.1, Sobolev training with the target f constructed there has infimum zero, which is not attained, and the parameters diverge along every minimizing sequence (Proposition 4.13).

Scope and outline. Our results concern existence at fixed width, they do not assert that the minimizer of an energy over the whole Sobolev space is a neural network. The convergence of the minimal energies as $N \to \infty$ is a separate question, considered for instance in [2, 3, 11, 16]. Section 2 proves the closedness of $\mathcal{N}_N$ and discusses the role of connectedness of Ω. Section 3 establishes the non-closedness for two hidden layers of respective sizes 4 and 6. Section 4 contains the applications to Deep Ritz, Sobolev training, Lipschitz learning and weight decay, as well as the failure of existence for two hidden layers. We conclude with a discussion in Section 5.

2 Weak closedness of one-hidden-layer ReLU networks in Sobolev spaces

Throughout this section, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *bounded, open and connected* set and

$$R := \sup_{x \in \Omega} |x| < \infty.$$

We denote by $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ the Sobolev space of L^p functions with weak first derivatives in L^p, $p \in [1, \infty]$. In what follows, $\sigma(t) := \max(t, 0)$ denotes the ReLU activation function. For $\theta = (w, b) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$z_\theta(x) := w \cdot x + b, \qquad H_\theta := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ z_\theta(x) = 0\}, \qquad -\theta := (-w, -b),$$

so that $H_{-\theta} = H_\theta$ and $z_{-\theta} = -z_\theta$. The function $\sigma(z_\theta)$ is called a *neuron* with parameter θ and *break hyperplane* H_θ.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the $(d+1)$-dimensional real vector space of affine functions of the form $x \mapsto p \cdot x + q$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and by $\mathcal{A}|_U$ their restrictions to a set U.

Definition 2.1 (Shallow ReLU networks of width at most N)**.** For an integer $N \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{N}_N := \left\{ u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \ : \ u = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \, \sigma(z_{\theta_i}) + c, \ a_i, c \in \mathbb{R}, \ \theta_i \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R} \right\} \tag{1}$$

Remark 2.2. Note that (1) coincides with the usual definition of single-layer neural networks; indeed, by the positive homogeneity of ReLU we have $a\sigma(w \cdot x + b) = a|w| \, \sigma(\frac{w}{|w|} \cdot x + \frac{b}{|w|})$ such that $w \neq 0$ can be normalized to $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, and $w = 0$ produces a constant absorbed in c.

We will use the following two identities repeatedly: First, since $\sigma(t) = \sigma(-t) + t$ and $-z_\theta = z_{-\theta}$, we have

$$a\,\sigma(z_\theta) = a\,\sigma(z_{-\theta}) + a\,z_\theta \qquad \text{for all } a \in \mathbb{R},\ \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{2}$$

Second, affine functions on Ω cost one neuron: Indeed, for $v \neq 0$ we have

$$v \cdot x + q = |v|\,\sigma\Big(\frac{v}{|v|} \cdot x + R + 1\Big) + q - |v|(R+1) \qquad \text{on } \Omega, \qquad \text{hence} \quad \mathcal{A}|_\Omega \subset \mathcal{N}_1. \tag{3}$$

We can now state the main result of this section:

Theorem 2.3 (Closedness)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, open and connected, and $N \geq 1$. Let $u^n \in \mathcal{N}_N$ satisfy*

$$u^n \to u \ \text{ in } L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) \qquad \text{and} \qquad u \in W^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega).$$

Then $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$. In particular, $\mathcal{N}_N$ is weakly closed in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$: if $u^n \in \mathcal{N}_N$ and

$$u^n \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } W^{1,p}(\Omega), \qquad 1 \leq p < \infty,$$

then $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$. The same statement holds for $p = \infty$ with respect to the weak- convergence.*

Note that for $p > d$ and Ω Lipschitz, Morrey's compact embedding turns weak $W^{1,p}$ convergence into uniform convergence on $\overline{\Omega}$. Theorem 2.3 then follows from the closedness of shallow ReLU networks in the uniform norm of [15] when Ω is a cube. The novelty of our result lies in that we do not have to assume Lipschitz of the boundary of Ω and in the full treatment of the $p \leq d$ cases. Note that this closedness result also applies to $p = 1$ but the existence result from Section 4 does not, due to a lack of weak compactness in $W^{1,1}$.

Before going to the proof of Theorem 2.3, we give the following elementary lemma:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open ball, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $H_\theta \cap B \neq \emptyset$, and $q \in \mathcal{A}$. If $q\,\mathbf{1}_{\{z_\theta > 0\}} \in W^{1,1}(B)$, then $q = A\,z_\theta$ for some $A \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Write $\theta = (w, b)$, $B_+ := B \cap \{z_\theta > 0\}$, $v := q\,\mathbf{1}_{B_+}$. The set B_+ is a Lipschitz domain whose boundary inside B is $H_\theta \cap B$, with outer unit normal $-w$. For $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B)$ the divergence theorem gives

$$\int_B v\,\partial_j\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{B_+} q\,\partial_j\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_{B_+} \partial_j q\,\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x - w_j \int_{H_\theta \cap B} q\,\varphi\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Thus, as distributions on B,

$$\partial_j v = (\partial_j q)\,\mathbf{1}_{B_+} + w_j\,q\,\mathcal{H}^{d-1}\llcorner(H_\theta \cap B).$$

If $v \in W^{1,1}(B)$, then $\partial_j v \in L^1(B)$ for all j. Since w is a unit vector, it has at least one non-zero entry and hence the singular part of the distribution must vanish for some j, i.e., $q = 0$ holds $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$-a.e. and hence (by continuity) everywhere on $H_\theta \cap B$. This is a nonempty relatively open subset of the hyperplane H_θ and an affine function vanishing there vanishes on all of H_θ. Finally, affine functions vanishing on $\{z_\theta = 0\}$ are exactly the multiples of z_θ. □

We can now proceed to show the main result.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The second statement follows from the first. To see this, note that for $1 \leq p < \infty$, this follows from the Rellich theorem: Indeed, weak convergence in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ implies strong convergence in $L^p(B) \hookrightarrow L^1(B)$ for every ball B with $\overline{B} \subset \Omega$. For $p = \infty$, this is a consequence of the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, since weakly-* converging sequences in $W^{1,\infty}(B)$

are bounded in $W^{1,\infty}(B)$ hence equi-Lipschitz. Covering a compact subset $K \subset \Omega$ by finitely many balls proves the second statement.

Next, we prove the first statement. Write the sequence of neural networks $u^n \in \mathcal{N}_N$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows:

$$u^n = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^n \, \sigma(z_{\theta_i^n}) + c^n, \qquad \theta_i^n = (w_i^n, b_i^n) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

In order to keep the notations as clear as possible, we shall pass to subsequences several times without relabeling. Since u is the limit of the whole sequence, the conclusion $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$ is not affected.

Step 1: sorting the neurons. First, we distinguish between neurons for which the break hyperplanes stay in Ω and the ones that eventually leave Ω. More precisely, for each $1 \leq i \leq N$, at least one of the sets

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : H_{\theta_i^n} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset\} \qquad \text{or} \qquad \{n \in \mathbb{N} : H_{\theta_i^n} \cap \Omega = \emptyset\}$$

is infinite. If the first one is, we put $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{in}}$; otherwise, $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{out}}$. Starting from $i = 1$, we can recursively extract N subsequences of $(\theta_i^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{in}} \iff H_{\theta_i^n} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{out}} \iff H_{\theta_i^n} \cap \Omega = \emptyset \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since Ω is connected, for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{out}}$, the linear functions $z_{\theta_i^n}$ have constant sign on Ω. This implies that the corresponding neurons are either 0 or affine for all n on Ω. Hence, we obtain

$$u^n = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{in}}} a_i^n \, \sigma(z_{\theta_i^n}) + \ell^n(x), \tag{4}$$

where ℓ^n is an affine remainder.

Next, observe that only neurons that share the same limiting hyperplane could potentially create a jump at the limit. Hence, for $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{in}}$, we can further group the neurons in a way that every neuron of each group shares the same limiting hyperplane. Indeed, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{in}}$, there exists $x \in \Omega$ such that $w_i^n \cdot x + b_i^n = 0$ hence $|b_i^n| = |w_i^n \cdot x| \leq R$. Hence, the full parameter sequence θ_i^n is bounded and up to a subsequence, there exists θ_i such that $\theta_i^n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \theta_i$. Using the equivalence relation $i \sim j$ when $\theta_i = \pm\theta_j$ (meaning that $H_{\theta_i} = H_{\theta_j}$), we partition $\mathcal{I}_{\text{in}}$ into equivalence classes $C_1, \ldots, C_L$ for $L \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$.

For each $1 \leq k \leq L$, let $\theta^{(k)}$ be a representative of the class. For $i \in C_k$, if $\theta_i = -\theta^{(k)}$, we can replace every neuron $a_i^n \sigma(z_{\theta_i^n})$ by $a_i^n \sigma(z_{-\theta_i^n}) + a_i^n z_{\theta_i^n}$ in u^n using (2). By flipping the sign of such θ_i^n, we have that for all $i \in C_k$, $\theta_i^n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \theta^{(k)}$. Hence, we can further reduce (4) to

$$u^n = \sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{i \in C_k} a_i^n \, \sigma(z_{\theta_i^n}) + \ell^n(x) \tag{5}$$

where we put all the $a_i^n z_{\theta_i^n}$ in the affine remainder ℓ^n. As a consequence the parameters θ_i^n and the affine reminder $\ell^n(x)$ in this formula are, in general, different from the ones in (4).

We can further group the neurons according to whether the limit hyperplane still intersects Ω or is tangent to it: to this purpose, we denote

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{in}} = \{k \in \{1, \ldots, L\} : H_{\theta^{(k)}} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{K}_{\tan} = \{k \in \{1, \ldots, L\} : H_{\theta^{(k)}} \cap \Omega = \emptyset\}.$$




Figure 1: Construction of $x_0 \in \Omega$ lying on $H_{\theta^{(k)}}$ but on no other limiting break hyperplane. Hence, on the ball $B(x_0, r)$ the neural network u^n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough is of the form $u^n = v_k^n + \ell_k^n$ for v_k^n as in (6) and some affine function $\ell_k^n \in \mathcal{A}$.

Moreover, we will denote by

$$v_k^n = \sum_{i \in C_k} a_i^n \sigma(z_{\theta_i^n}) \tag{6}$$

the contribution of a single cluster in (5).

Step 2: limit of a single cluster. We will now study the limits of the cluster contributions v_k^n defined in (6) as $n \to \infty$. For this, we distinguish between the simple case where k corresponds to a tangent limiting hyperplane and the more interesting one where k corresponds to a hyperplane that intersects Ω.

Let $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{tan}}$. Up to changing the affine remainder ℓ^n, we can use (2) and the connectedness of Ω to assume that $z_{\theta^{(k)}} < 0$ on Ω. This implies that for all compact $K \subset \Omega$, we have that for all $i \in C_k$ and n large enough, $z_{\theta_i^n} < 0$ on K: hence, $v_k^n \to 0$ on K.

Now let $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}$. We first show that near the hyperplane $H_{\theta^{(k)}}$, the limit function is of the form $u = m + q\mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta^{(k)}} > 0\}}$ where m and q are affine. Indeed, let

$$x_0 \in (H_{\theta^{(k)}} \cap \Omega) \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq k} H_{\theta^{(j)}}$$

be a point in Ω that lies on the break hyperplane $H_{\theta^{(k)}}$ but on now other break hyperplane. For $r > 0$ small enough, since all break hyperplanes $H_{\theta^{(k)}}$ for $1 \leq k \leq L$ are mutually different, $B := B(x_0, r)$ is such that $\overline{B} \subset \Omega$ and $\overline{B} \cap H_{\theta^{(j)}} = \emptyset$ for all $j \neq k$. In particular, this implies that on B, for n large enough, every neuron in a cluster $j \neq k$ is affine; hence u^n is of the form $u^n = v_k^n + \ell_k^n$ for some affine function ℓ_k^n. See Figure 1 for an illustration of the construction.

Define

$$B^+ := B \cap \{z_{\theta^{(k)}} > 0\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad B^- := B \cap \{z_{\theta^{(k)}} < 0\},$$

and let $K^- \subset B^-$ be compact with non-empty interior. Since $\theta_i^n \to \theta^{(k)}$ then for n large enough, $z_{\theta_i^n} < 0$ on K^- for all $i \in C_k$ and hence $u^n = \ell_k^n$ on K^-. Since $u^n \to u$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ then in particular $\ell_k^n \to u$ in $L^1(K^-)$, which implies that u is affine on K^-. By taking a sequence of compact sets exhausting B^-, we get that u is affine on B^-: we denote by m_k the affine function such that $u = m_k$ on B^-. Moreover, since the space of affine functions $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite-dimensional vector space space and the $L^1(K^-)$ norm is a norm on it, we have that $\ell_k^n \to m_k$ in $\mathcal{A}$.

By the same arguments, on a compact subset $K^+ \subset B^+$ with non-empty interior, v_k^n is of the form

$$v_k^n = \sum_{i \in C_k} a_i^n z_{\theta_i^n} =: P_k^n \in \mathcal{A}$$

for n large enough. Hence the limit u is also equal to some affine function on B^+. Moreover, on K^+, we have that $\ell_k^n \to m_k$ for the same affine function m_k as before, hence $P_k^n = u^n - \ell_k^n \to u - m_k =: q_k$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with $q_k \in \mathcal{A}$ also being affine. By exhausting B^+ by such sets K^+, we have that $u = m_k + q_k$ on B^+.

It follows that

$$u = m_k + q_k \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} \quad \text{a.e. on } B. \tag{7}$$

Since $u \in W^{1,1}(B)$ by assumption and $m_k \in \mathcal{A}$ trivially lies in $W^{1,1}(B)$, we have that $q_k \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} \in W^{1,1}(B)$ hence by Lemma 2.4, $q_k = A_k z_{\theta(k)}$ for some $A_k \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$v_k^n = u_k^n - \ell_k^n \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} q_k \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} = A_k z_{\theta(k)} \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} = A_k \sigma(z_{\theta(k)})$$

in $L^1(B)$.

It turns out that the convergence $P_k^n \to q_k = A_k z_{\theta(k)}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ already implies that v_k^n converges uniformly on suitable compactly contained subsets: Let $D \subset \Omega$ be compact and $\varepsilon > 0$. Define $D_{k,\varepsilon} := D \cap \{|z_{\theta(k)}| \geq \varepsilon\}$. The uniform convergence $z_{\theta_i^n} \to z_{\theta(k)}$ shows that, for n large, every $z_{\theta_i^n}$ with $i \in C_k$ has the sign of $z_{\theta(k)}$ in $D_{k,\varepsilon}$, see Figure 2. Hence $v_k^n = \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} P_k^n$ there, which means that

$$v_k^n = \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} P_k^n \to \mathbf{1}_{\{z_{\theta(k)} > 0\}} A_k z_{\theta(k)} = A_k \sigma(z_{\theta(k)}) \tag{8}$$

uniformly on $D_{k,\varepsilon}$. In this sense, each cluster collapses to at most one neuron in the limit.




Figure 2: Definition of the set $D_{k,\varepsilon}$ on which $z_{\theta_i^n}$ with $i \in C_k$ and $z_{\theta(k)}$ have the same sign for large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since the former converges uniformly to the latter.

Step 3: the limit is in $\mathcal{N}_N$. Let $D \subset \Omega$ be compact with nonempty interior, and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be so small that

$$D_\varepsilon := D \cap \bigcap_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}} \{|z_{\theta(k)}| \geq \varepsilon\} = \bigcap_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}} D_{k,\varepsilon}.$$

has nonempty interior. Obviously, this is possible since $\mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}$ is finite. Since $D_\varepsilon \subset D_{k,\varepsilon}$ for every $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}$, (8) in the end of Step 2 gives $v_k^n \to A_k \sigma(z_{\theta(k)})$ uniformly on D_ε for $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}$.

Furthermore, $v_k^n = 0$ on D_ε for $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{tan}}$ and n large since D_ε is compactly contained in Ω. Hence,

$$\ell^n = u^n - \sum_{k=1}^{L} v_k^n \longrightarrow u - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}} A_k \sigma(z_{\theta^{(k)}}) \qquad \text{in } L^1(D_\varepsilon) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

As in Step 2, the affine functions ℓ^n converge in $\mathcal{A}$ to some affine ℓ, which does not depend on D or ε. Since the sets D_ε exhaust $\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}} H_{\theta^{(k)}}$ which differs from Ω just by a Lebesgue nullset, we have

$$u = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}} A_k \sigma(z_{\theta^{(k)}}) + \ell \qquad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

To conclude the proof, we must show that u can be represented with at most N neurons. There are two cases:

If $\sharp \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}} = N$, it means that $\mathcal{I}_{\text{out}} = \emptyset$ and hence $\ell^n = c^n \in \mathbb{R}$ in (4). Moreover, since by definition of the set $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{in}}$ and the number L, we have $\sharp \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}} \leq L \leq N$, in this case it has to hold $L = N$ and each class $C_1, \dots, C_N$ has exactly one element. Hence, there is no need to use (2) and we do not have an additional affine remainder. Finally, Step 2 tells us that

$$u = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}}} A_k \sigma(z_{\theta^{(k)}}) + c$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ hence $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$.

If $\sharp \mathcal{K}_{\text{in}} \leq N - 1$, we can use (3) to represent the affine remainder ℓ at the cost of one neuron, also leading to $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$. □

Remark 2.5 (Comparison with [6]). In [6], the authors also observe that neurons of the type of (7), which are not necessarily ReLU neurons, naturally arise as L^p-limit of ReLU networks in the context of regression problems. They call these neurons *generalized responses*, and in their analysis, they rule out such neurons by showing that they can not improve the loss. In our case (where no loss is involved), such neurons are shown to be actually representable by ReLU neurons thanks to the regularity of the limit alone.

Remark 2.6 (Disconnected Ω). Connectedness is essential in the argument: we need the collapse of neurons to occur in the domain in order to control the jump. Take the following simple counterexample. Let $\Omega = (-1, 0) \cup (0, 1)$

$$u_n(x) := (n+1)\sigma(x + 1/n) - n\sigma(x),$$

and $u(x) := (x+1)\mathbf{1}_{\{x>0\}} \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. Then we have that $u_n \to u$ in L^1_{loc}, but $u \notin \mathcal{N}_M$ for any M since ReLU networks are continuous on $\mathbb{R}$.

One could ask whether asking the connected components to be at positive distance restores Theorem 2.3. While it is the case in dimension 1, it still fails in higher dimension. Indeed, consider the set Ω in Figure 3 and $u_n(x) = \sigma(nx_2) - \sigma(nx_2 - 1)$. Then $u_n \to u$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ where $u(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{x_2>0\}}$. However, the latter is not representable by a shallow network with two neurons.

In many applications, most prominently in the Deep Ritz method, it is of interest to be able to impose boundary conditions for the function class at hand. For instance, if one works in the Sobolev space $H^1_0(\Omega)$, it is common to consider neural networks of the form $u = \varphi\tilde{u}$ where $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{N}_N$ and φ is a positive function on Ω that vanishes in $\partial\Omega$, see, for instance, [30] for an early example. A typical choice for φ would be $\varphi := \text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Omega)$, the distance function to the boundary of Ω. The next corollary allows us to extend Theorem 2.3 to such class of networks:




Figure 3: A domain Ω with two connected components at positive distance from each other. The only hyperplane H that separates the components is tangent to both of them, preventing u to be represented by a neural network.

Corollary 2.7 (Networks with hard constraints)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, open and connected, and $N \geq 1$. Let $\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\varphi > 0$ in Ω and $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and define $\mathcal{V}_N := \varphi \mathcal{N}_N \subset W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$. Let $u^n \in \mathcal{V}_N$ satisfy*

$$u^n \to u \quad \text{in } L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) \qquad \text{and} \qquad u \in W^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega).$$

Then $u \in \mathcal{V}_N$. In particular, $\mathcal{V}_N$ is weakly closed in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$: if $u^n \in \mathcal{V}_N$ and

$$u^n \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } W^{1,p}(\Omega), \qquad 1 \leq p < \infty,$$

then $u \in \mathcal{V}_N$. The same statement holds for $p = \infty$ with respect to the weak- convergence.*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, the second statement follows from the first, and we just prove the first one.

Fix a ball B with $\overline{B} \subset \Omega$. By assumption $u^n \to u$ in $L^1(B)$ where $u \in W^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$. Since $u^n = \varphi v^n$ for $v^n \in \mathcal{N}_N$, B is compactly supported in Ω, and φ is continuous and positive on Ω, we obtain that $\varphi \geq c_B > 0$ on $\overline{B}$ and hence

$$v^n = \frac{u^n}{\varphi} \to \frac{u}{\varphi} =: v \text{ in } L^1(B). \tag{9}$$

Since φ lies in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, it even holds $v \in W^{1,1}(B)$. Covering an arbitrary compactly contained subset of Ω by such balls gives $v^n \to v$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ with $v \in W^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$. By Theorem 2.3, $v \in \mathcal{N}_N$, so $u = \varphi v \in \mathcal{V}_N$. This concludes the proof. □

3 Non-closedness for deeper networks

In this section, we show that the set of ReLU networks with two hidden layers of fixed size is **not closed** in any Sobolev space $W^{1,p}$ or in the space of continuous functions. The latter result disproves a conjecture of [15] stating that the set of ReLU networks of a fixed complexity is closed in $C(\overline{\Omega})$; they proved this result in two particular cases, namely for shallow ReLU networks with one hidden layer and deep networks with some parameter bound. It turns out that it is false in general, i.e., for deep networks without parameter bounds. A first result in this direction can be found in [7], where the authors show that imposing certain sparsity patterns on the weight matrices of deep ReLU networks can break the closedness. However, their result does not apply to dense networks.

We will focus on networks with two hidden layers. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ be the set of functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$u(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} a_k \, \sigma\Big(\sum_{e=1}^{N} c_{ke} \, \sigma(w_e \cdot x + b_e) + d_k \Big) + c, \tag{10}$$

with $a_k, c_{ke}, d_k, b_e, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w_e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $e = 1, \dots, N$ and $k = 1 \dots, M$. These are the two-hidden-layer networks with first width at most N and second width at most M. The main theorem is the following:

Theorem 3.1 (Non-closedness)**.** *Let $d \geq 2$, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded, open set. There exist a Lipschitz continuous and piecewise affine function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, a sequence of two-hidden-layer networks $(u^\eta)_{\eta>0} \subset \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ and constants $C_p, C_\eta, C > 0$ such that, for $0 < \eta < C_\eta$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, we have*

$$\|u^\eta - f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\eta, \qquad \|\nabla u^\eta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C, \qquad \int_\Omega |\nabla(u^\eta - f)|^p \, \mathrm{d}x \leq C_p \, \eta,$$

and $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}(\Omega)$ for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$.

In particular, Theorem 3.1 states that $\mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ is not closed in $C(\overline{\Omega})$. It is also not strongly (and hence not weakly) closed in any $W^{1,p}$ with $1 \leq p < \infty$. In the construction, some second-layer weights of u^η are of order η^{-1}, while $\|u^\eta - f\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C\eta^{1/p}$. This blow-up of the parameters cannot be avoided, see Proposition 4.13 (ii) in Section 4. The same networks also show non-closedness for the weak-$*$ topology of $W^{1,\infty}$, which is the exact counterpart of the case $p = \infty$ of Theorem 2.3:

Corollary 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, $u^\eta \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} f$ in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ as $\eta \to 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{N}_{4,6}(\Omega)$ is not weakly-$*$ closed in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Uniform convergence $u^\eta \to f$ implies $u^\eta \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} f$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. For the gradients, let $g \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, and choose $g_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon$. Since $\|\nabla u^\eta\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$ and f is Lipschitz, Theorem 3.1 with $p = 1$ gives

$$\Big| \int_\Omega (\nabla u^\eta - \nabla f) \cdot g \, \mathrm{d}x \Big| \leq \big(C + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty}\big)\varepsilon + \|g_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \, C_1 \, \eta.$$

Letting $\eta \to 0$ and then $\varepsilon \to 0$ gives $\nabla u^\eta \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla f$ in $L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. □

Whether $\mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ is closed for the norm topology of $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ remains open, but this property would not be very useful anyway since the relevant energies on $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ do not provide sufficient compactness for strong convergence in that space.

In order to show Theorem 3.1, we first show the following proposition:

Proposition 3.3. *Let $Q := (0,5) \times (0,2) \times (0,1)^{d-2}$, let $L \geq 2$ and let $Q_L := (-L, 5+L) \times (-L, L)^{d-1}$, so that $Q \subset Q_L$. There exist $f : Q_L \to \mathbb{R}$ Lipschitz and $(u^\eta)_{\eta>0} \subset \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that, for $0 < \eta < 1/2L$,*

(i) $\|u^\eta - f\|_{L^\infty(Q_L)} \leq C\eta$;

(ii) $\|\nabla u^\eta\|_{L^\infty(Q_L)} \leq C$, *and for every $p \in [1, \infty)$ there is C_p with* $\|\nabla(u^\eta - f)\|^p_{L^p(Q_L)} \leq C_p \, \eta$;

(iii) $f \in \mathcal{N}_{5,6}(Q_L)$, *and $f|_Q \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}(Q)$ for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$.*

3.1 Construction of the limit

Before we give the proof of Proposition 3.3, we will construct the target f and the approximating sequence of neural networks u^η. In the sequel, we will denote $x = (x_1, x_2, \bar{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\eta > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x) &= \sigma(x_1 - 1) & h_1^\eta(x) &= \sigma(x_1 - 1 + 2\eta x_2) \\ h_2(x) &= \sigma(x_1 - 2) & h_2^\eta(x) &= \sigma(x_1 - 2 + \eta x_2) \\ h_3(x) &= \sigma(3 - x_1) & h_3^\eta(x) &= \sigma(3 - x_1 + \eta x_2) \\ h_4(x) &= \sigma(4 - x_1) & h_4^\eta(x) &= \sigma(4 - x_1 + 2\eta x_2) \end{aligned}$$

be first layer neurons and for $\lambda > 2L$, put

$$K(x) = \lambda h_3(x) + h_4(x) \qquad K^\eta(x) = \lambda h_3^\eta(x) + h_4^\eta(x). \tag{11}$$

Let

$$x_2^\eta = \frac{h_1^\eta(x) - h_2^\eta(x) - 1}{\eta}. \tag{12}$$

This notation is motivated by the fact that on the right half $(5/2, 5 + L) \times (-L, L)^{d-1}$ of Q_L, we have $x_2^\eta = x_2$ for $\eta < 1/2L$. Using the previously defined functions, we can further put

$$g_j(x) = \sigma\left(x_2 - c_j - K(x)\right) \qquad g_j^\eta(x) = \sigma\left(x_2^\eta - c_j - K^\eta(x)\right) \tag{13}$$

for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ to be defined later. Let $S(x) = (5 - x_1, x_2, \bar{x})$ be the reflection with respect to the $x_1 = 5/2$ hyperplane and define the target function f and its approximations u^η as:

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} g_j(x) + (g_j \circ S)(x) \qquad u^\eta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} g_j^\eta(x) + (g_j^\eta \circ S)(x), \qquad x \in Q_L. \tag{14}$$

Note that the target is depicted in Figure 4 for $d = 2$ and $d = 3$, while the u^η are depicted in Figure 5 for $d = 2$. From the construction it seems believable that u^η converges to f and we will prove this in the next subsection. First, we show that indeed $f \in \mathcal{N}_{5,6}$ and $u^\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $\eta > 0$ the functions $f : Q_L \to \mathbb{R}$ and $u^\eta : Q_L \to \mathbb{R}$ defined in (14) satisfy $f \in \mathcal{N}_{5,6}(Q_L)$ and $u^\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{4,6}(Q_L)$.*

Proof. By expanding the definition of f and u^η and also using that $K \circ S = h_1 + \lambda h_2$ and $K^\eta \circ S = h_1^\eta + \lambda h_2^\eta$, we get

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\big(x_2 - c_j - \lambda h_3(x) - h_4(x))\big) + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\big(x_2 - c_j - \lambda h_2(x) - h_1(x)\big)$$

and similarly

$$u^\eta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\big(x_2^\eta - c_j - \lambda h_3^\eta(x) - h_4^\eta(x)\big) + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\big(x_2^\eta \circ S - c_j - \lambda h_2^\eta(x) - h_1^\eta(x)\big).$$

Written as is, f is not a neural network since x_2 must be the output of some first-layer neuron, whereas x_2^η in the definition of u^η is. On Q_L, it however trivially holds that $x_2 = \sigma(x_2 + L) - L$




Figure 4: The target f on Q with $\lambda = 5$ for $d = 2$ (left) and $d = 3$ (right). For $d = 3$, f does not depend on x_3, and only the slices $\{x_3 = 0\}$ and $\{x_3 = 1\}$ are shown. The orange lines are the zero level sets $\{x_2 - c_j - K(x) = 0\}$ of the arguments of the g_j (right side) and their mirror images $\{x_2 - c_j - K(S(x)) = 0\}$ (left side); the dashed lines are the walls $\{x_1 = k\}$, $k = 1, \dots, 4$. The set $\mathcal{P}$ used in the proof of Proposition 3.3 (iii) consists of twelve points for $d = 2$ and of twelve segments parallel to the x_3-axis for $d = 3$.

which implies that

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\big(\sigma(x_2 + L) - L - c_j - \lambda h_3(x) - h_4(x))\big) + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\big(\sigma(x_2 + L) - L - c_j - \lambda h_2(x) - h_1(x)\big)$$

and, hence, $f \in \mathcal{N}_{5,6}(Q_L)$, with first-layer neurons $h_1, \dots, h_4$ and $\sigma(x_2 + L)$.

Continuing with the functions u^η, one can further expand the definition of x_2^η from (12) to get

$$u^\eta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\left(\frac{h_1^\eta(x) - h_2^\eta(x) - 1}{\eta} - c_j - \lambda h_3^\eta(x) - h_4^\eta(x)\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma\left(\frac{h_4^\eta(x) - h_3^\eta(x) - 1}{\eta} - c_j - \lambda h_2^\eta(x) - h_1^\eta(x)\right)$$

and hence $u^\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ with first-layer neurons $h_1^\eta, \dots, h_4^\eta$. □

Remark 3.5. Importantly, Lemma 3.4 does not show that $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}$ for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$. This we will prove in Section 3.3 for a suitable choice of c_j. The core mechanism of the proof is that while the function $x \mapsto x_2$ in the first layer can be approximated using the 4 first layer neurons of u^η, it can not be exactly represented without adding an additional neuron. Note that, more generally, continuous, piece-wise linear functions can always be represented by a deep ReLU network (see for instance [13, 17, 22]).

3.2 Convergence of the sequence of neural networks

We continue with proving the statements *(i)–(ii)* in Proposition 3.3 which assert that the neural networks u^η indeed converge to f (uniformly, strongly in $W^{1,p}(Q_L)$, and by Corollary 3.2 also weak-* in $W^{1,\infty}(Q_L)$). See Figure 5 for an illustration of the convergence.




Figure 5: The networks $u^\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ with $\lambda = 5$ for $\eta = 0.4, 0.2, 0.1$ and their limit $f \in \mathcal{N}_{5,6}$ (bottom right), on $Q = (0,5) \times (0,2)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.3 (i)–(ii). By symmetry it suffices to work on $Q_L^+ = Q_L \cap \{x_1 > 5/2\}$. We first show that the terms g_j and g_j^η defined in (13) vanish on $Q_L^- := Q_L \cap \{x_1 < 5/2\}$. First, note that K defined in (11) is a decreasing function of x_1 hence given that $\lambda > 2L$ then $K((5/2, x_2, \bar{x})) > L$ which implies that $K > L$ on Q_L^-. Together with $x_2 < L$ and $c_j > 0$, this implies that $x_2 - c_j - K(x) < 0$ and hence $g_j(x) = 0$ for all $x \in Q_L^-$. To show that $g_j^\eta(x) = 0$, we first show that $x_2^\eta \le x_2$ for $x \in Q_L^-$. Indeed, we have that $\sigma(a) - \sigma(b) \le \sigma(a-b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, hence

$$x_2^\eta = \frac{\sigma(x_1 - 1 + 2\eta x_2) - \sigma(x_1 - 2 + \eta x_2) - 1}{\eta} \le \frac{\sigma(\eta x_2 + 1) - 1}{\eta} = \max\left(x_2, -\frac{1}{\eta}\right).$$

If $x_2 \ge 0$, then $K^\eta(x) \ge K(x)$ by the monotonicity of σ, hence $x_2^\eta - c_j - K^\eta(x) \le x_2 - K(x) < 0$. If $x_2 < 0$, then $x_2^\eta - c_j - K^\eta(x) \le x_2 < 0$, since $K^\eta \ge 0$. In both cases, $g_j^\eta(x) = 0$.

Hence, we proved that $g_j, g_j^\eta = 0$ on Q_L^-. By symmetry, $g_j^\eta \circ S$ and $g_j \circ S$ vanish on Q_L^+. Then, using also $x_2^\eta = x_2$ on Q_L^+ from (14) we get

$$u^\eta(x) - f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \Big[\sigma\big(x_2 - c_j - K^\eta(x)\big) - \sigma\big(x_2 - c_j - K(x)\big)\Big], \qquad x \in Q_L^+.$$

Using that σ is 1-Lipschitz and the definition of K, K^η from (11) we get

$$|u^\eta(x) - f(x)| \le 3|K^\eta(x) - K(x)| \le 3(\lambda + 2)\eta |x_2|, \qquad x \in Q_L^+.$$

Furthermore, on the line $\{x_1 = 5/2\}$ both functions vanish. Taking the supremum over Q_L, this proves *(i)*.

For *(ii)*, letting $e_2 := (0,1)^\top$ denote the second canonical unit vector, note that almost everywhere on Q^+ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla g_j^\eta &= \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in Q_L^+ \,:\, x_2 - c_j - K^\eta(x) > 0\}} \big(e_2 - \nabla K^\eta\big) \\ \text{with} \quad \nabla K^\eta &= \lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{h_3^\eta > 0\}} (-1, \eta)^\top + \mathbf{1}_{\{h_4^\eta > 0\}} (-1, 2\eta)^\top. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Hence $|\nabla g_j^\eta| \le C$ which, using that η is bounded, leads to $|\nabla u^\eta| \le C$ (for a different C). The same formulas with $\eta = 0$ hold for ∇g_j hence $|\nabla f| \le C$.

Let $E_\eta \subset Q_L^+$ be the union of the strips $\{|x_1 - 3| \le L\eta\}$ and $\{|x_1 - 4| \le 2L\eta\}$ with the three bands $\{|x_2 - c_j - K(x)| \le (\lambda + 2)L\eta\}$ (all restricted to Q_L^+). Since (by Cavalieri's principle)

$$|\{|x_1 - 3| \le L\eta\}| = C_1\eta, \quad |\{|x_1 - 4| \le 2L\eta\}| = C_2\eta, \quad |\{|x_2 - c_j - K(x)| \le (\lambda + 2)L\eta\}| \le C_3\eta$$

for constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$, we get $|E_\eta| \le C\eta$ for some $C > 0$ that only depends on L and d.

We now show that $\{h_4^\eta > 0\} = \{h_4 > 0\}$. Let $x \in Q_L^+ \setminus E_\eta$. Since $|x_2| < L$, we have

$$|2\eta x_2| < 2L\eta < |4 - x_1|.$$

Now observe that for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $|a - b| < |b|$ implies that a and b are nonzero and have the same sign. By choosing $a = 4 - x_1 + 2\eta x_2$ and $b = 4 - x_1$ in the previous inequality, we have that $4 - x_1 + 2\eta x_2$ and $4 - x_1$ have the same sign hence $\{h_4^\eta > 0\} = \{h_4 > 0\}$. In a similar fashion, $\{h_3^\eta > 0\} = \{h_3 > 0\}$ and using that

$$|K^\eta(x) - K(x)| \le (\lambda + 2)L\eta < |x_2 - c_j - K(x)|,$$

we have $\{x_2 > c_j + K^\eta\} = \{x_2 > c_j + K\}$. Combined with (15), it leads to

$$|\nabla g_j^\eta - \nabla g_j| \le |\nabla K^\eta - \nabla K| \le (\lambda + 2)\eta$$

which implies $|\nabla u^\eta - \nabla f| \le C\eta$. Using the same arguments on the mirrored half

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_L} |\nabla(u^\eta - f)|^p &\le 2 \int_{Q_L^+ \setminus E_\eta} |\nabla(u^\eta - f)|^p + 2 \int_{E_\eta} |\nabla(u^\eta - f)|^p \\
&\le 2 \int_{Q_L^+ \setminus E_\eta} |\nabla(u^\eta - f)|^p + 2 \int_{E_\eta} (|\nabla u^\eta| + |\nabla f|)^p \\
&\le 2 \int_{Q_L^+ \setminus E_\eta} (C\eta)^p + 2 \int_{E_\eta} C^p \\
&\le C_p \eta \quad \text{since } \eta < \frac{1}{2L} \le 1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.3 Non-representability of the limit

We now focus on showing the non-representability statement *(iii)* of Proposition 3.3 which asserts $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}$ for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, in other words, one needs at least five inner neurons to represent f as a neural network, as done in Lemma 3.4. We first introduce a notion of *local shallowness* of a function:

Definition 3.6. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open and $P \in U$. A function $g : U \to \mathbb{R}$ is *locally shallow at P* if it coincides, on some ball around P, with a shallow neural network of the form $x \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^I \alpha_i \sigma(v_i \cdot x + \beta_i) + \gamma$, where $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Sums and differences preserve this property, and so does composition with affine maps of the input. Shallow ReLU networks have the following structural property; a related observation already appears in the literature, for instance, in [8, Example 4.2], to show that certain continuous, piecewise linear functions can not be represented by a shallow network.

Lemma 3.7. *If g is locally shallow at $P \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $v \mapsto g(P + v) - g(P - v)$ is linear in a neighborhood of P.*

Proof. Shrink the ball so that every neuron with $v_i \cdot P + \beta_i \neq 0$ has constant sign on it. For small $|v|$, such a neuron contributes $2\alpha_i v_i \cdot v$ or 0 to $g(P + v) - g(P - v)$. A neuron with $v_i \cdot P + \beta_i = 0$ contributes $\alpha_i\big(\sigma(v_i \cdot v) - \sigma(-v_i \cdot v)\big) = \alpha_i\, v_i \cdot v$. The constant γ cancels. □




Figure 6: The function $g(x) = \sigma(x_2 - \kappa(x_1))$ of Lemma 3.8, for κ with a single breakpoint at t_0. The highlighted curve is $\{x_2 = \kappa(x_1)\}$, and g is not locally shallow at the point $P = (t_0, \kappa(t_0))$. The kinks of g near P lie on three half-lines starting at P, whereas the kinks of a shallow network lie on full lines.

The following lemma allows us to easily build ReLU networks that are not locally shallow around certain points, as illustrated in Figure 6.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\kappa : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and piecewise affine. Let t_0 be the position of a kink of κ, with κ having slopes $\lambda_- \neq \lambda_+$ in a left and right neighborhood of t_0. Then $g(x) := \sigma\big(x_2 - \kappa(x_1)\big)$ is not locally shallow at $P := (t_0, \kappa(t_0), x_3, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for arbitrary values of $x_3, \ldots, x_d \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let $t > 0$ be small enough that κ is affine on $[t_0 - t, t_0]$ and on $[t_0, t_0 + t]$ and in particular

$$\kappa(t_0 + t) = \kappa(t_0) + \lambda_+ t, \qquad \kappa(t_0 - t) = \kappa(t_0) - \lambda_- t.$$

Let $v_{s,t} := (t, s, 0, \ldots, 0)$ with $|s| \leq (|\lambda_-| + |\lambda_+| + 1)t$. Then

$$g(P + v_{s,t}) - g(P - v_{s,t}) = \sigma(s - \lambda_+ t) - \sigma(\lambda_- t - s).$$

As a function of s, the derivative of this Lipschitz-continuous function is $\mathbf{1}_{\{s > \lambda_+ t\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{s < \lambda_- t\}}$. This takes both values 1 and 2 if $\lambda_+ < \lambda_-$, and both values 0 and 1 if $\lambda_+ > \lambda_-$. Hence, $s \mapsto g(P + v_{s,t}) - g(P - v_{s,t})$ for $|s| \leq (|\lambda_-| + |\lambda_+| + 1)t$ is not affine. Then if g were locally shallow at P, then for $t > 0$ small, Lemma 3.7 would give that $g(P + v_{s,t}) - g(P - v_{s,t})$ is linear in s and t which would lead to a contradiction. □

Let $u \in \mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ be of the form (10). We call the hyperplanes $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ w_e \cdot x + b_e = 0\}$ for which $1 \leq e \leq N$ with $w_e \neq 0$ the *first-layer hyperplanes* of u. Knowing that a ReLU network u is not locally shallow at a point P forces P to lie on a first-layer hyperplane, as we show in the next lemma:

Lemma 3.9. *If u is not locally shallow at $P \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then P lies on a first-layer hyperplane of u.*

Proof. Assume P lies on no first-layer hyperplane. Then any neuron with $w_e \neq 0$ is affine on a ball around P and equals 0 or $w_e \cdot x + b_e$ there. Any neuron with $w_e = 0$ coincides with the constant $\sigma(b_e)$. Hence, each inner sum in (10) is affine on that ball and, consequently, u is shallow there. This is a contradiction. □




Figure 7: The counting argument in the proof of Proposition 3.3 *(iii)*, with $c_j = j/10$. Four walls contain the twelve points of $\mathcal{P}$ (left), while a non-vertical first-layer line contains at most two points of $\mathcal{P}$ (right), which leaves two points out.

By Lemma 3.4 we already know that $f \in \mathcal{N}_{5,6}$ and it remains to prove that $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}$ for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$. The proof proceeds as follows: we assume for the sake of contradiction that $f \in \mathcal{N}_{4,M}$ for some M, and for $1 \leq j \leq 3$, let

$$S_j^1 = \{x \in Q : x_1 = 1, x_2 = c_j\} \qquad S_j^2 = \{x \in Q : x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1 + c_j\}$$
$$S_j^3 = \{x \in Q : x_1 = 3, x_2 = 1 + c_j\} \qquad S_j^4 = \{x \in Q : x_1 = 4, x_2 = c_j\}.$$

The S_j^i are points in $d = 2$ and segments of length 1 in $d = 3$. We can show that at every point in

$$\mathcal{P} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{3} \bigcup_{i=1}^{4} S_j^i,$$

f is not locally shallow (see Figure 4 for an illustration of the set $\mathcal{P}$ for $d = 2$). Using Lemma 3.9, this forces the first layer hyperplanes to contains every point of $\mathcal{P}$, which in turn forces every first layer hyperplane to be vertical using a counting argument with carefully chosen c_j. Finally, vertical first layer hyperplanes means that neurons of the first layer are of the form $x \mapsto \sigma(\alpha_k(x_1 - k))$, which implies that f does not depend on x_2, which is a contradiction.

Proof of Proposition 3.3 (iii). Observe that no three points of $\{(1,0),(2,1),(3,1),(4,0)\}$ lie on one line. Hence two or less of the sets

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0\} \qquad \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1\}$$
$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 3, x_2 = 1\} \qquad \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 4, x_2 = 0\}$$

lies in a given hyperplane. It follows that for $0 < c_1 < c_2 < c_3 < 1$ small enough, the only hyperplanes containing more that two segments in $\mathcal{P}$ are the vertical hyperplanes $\{x_1 = k\}$, $1 \leq k \leq 4$, which contains three each. Define f as in (14) and suppose for the sake of contradiction that $f \in \mathcal{N}_{4,M}$.

We start by showing that f is not locally shallow at any $P \in \mathcal{P}$. By the symmetry $f \circ S = f$ it suffices to show this for $P = (3, 1 + c_j, \bar{x})$ and $P = (4, c_j, \bar{x})$. Near such P, the mirrored terms $g_{j'} \circ S$ vanish for $1 \leq j' \leq 3$, as was shown in the proof of Proposition 3.3 *(i)–(ii)* in Section 3.2. Moreover, for $j' \neq j$, the 0-level set $\{x_2 - c_{j'} - K(x_1) = 0\}$ of $g_{j'}$ stays at vertical distance $\delta \geq \min_{i \neq j} |c_i - c_j| > 0$ from P. So $g_{j'}$ equals 0 or $x_2 - c_{j'} - K(x)$ in a small neighborhood of P, and both are shallow because K is and $x_2 = \sigma(x_2)$. Thus $f = g_j + h$ where h is a shallow ReLU network near P.

Next, let $\kappa(t) = c_j + \lambda\sigma(3 - t) + \sigma(4 - t)$ such that $K(x) + c_j = \kappa(x_1)$ and

$$g_j(x) = \sigma(x_2 - \kappa(x_1)).$$

Since $t \mapsto \kappa(t)$ has a breakpoint at $t = 3$ and at $t = 4$, Lemma 3.8 shows that g_j is not locally shallow at any of the choices of P above. Consequently, $f = g_j + h$ with shallow h cannot be locally shallow at P.

Using Lemma 3.9, we have that any S_j^i in $\mathcal{P}$ must lie on some first-layer hyperplane of f: indeed, since finitely many hyperplanes cover S_j^i, one of them contains it; otherwise each would meet the $(d-2)$-dimensional affine span of S_j^i in a set of measure zero. Note that we have 12 such S_j^i and 4 first-layer hyperplanes. Assume that some first layer hyperplane $\ell_e = \{w_e \cdot x + b_e = 0\}$ is not of the form $\{x_1 = k\}$. Hence, by construction of the c_j, ℓ_e passes at most by two distinct S_j^i. The remaining 3 first-layer hyperplanes must therefore pass through the 10 remaining S_j^i: this is not possible, since any hyperplane passes through at most 3 S_j^i (see Figure 7). Hence, the first layer lines of u are exactly the lines $\{x_1 = k\}$, $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Hence, every neuron on the first layer is of the form $x \mapsto \sigma(\alpha_k(x_1 - k))$ for numbers $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. This implies that f depends only on x_1. However, for $x \in Q$ with $x_1 > 4$ and $x_2 > 1$ we have

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma(x_2 - c_j - K(x)) = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sigma(x_2 - c_j)$$

which is clearly not constant in x_2 (see also Figures 4 and 5) and leads to a contradiction. □

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is now a straightforward consequence of Proposition 3.3:

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since Ω is open, there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $Q \subset \tilde{\Omega} := \alpha\Omega + \beta$. Since Ω is bounded $\tilde{\Omega}$ is and there exists $L \geq 2$ such that $\tilde{\Omega} \subset Q_L$. Then, using Proposition 3.3 restricted to $\tilde{\Omega}$, we have

$$\|u^\eta - f\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C\eta, \qquad \|\nabla u^\eta\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C, \qquad \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla(u^\eta - f)|^p \,\mathrm{d}x \leq C_p\,\eta$$

for all $0 < \eta < \frac{1}{2L} =: C_\eta$. Moreover, $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}(Q)$ hence $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,M}(\tilde{\Omega})$.

Now, putting $T(x) = \alpha x + \beta$, the functions $u^\eta \circ T$ are neural networks of the size of u^η on Ω (and similarly for $f \circ T$). Moreover, the previous inequalities holds on Ω for $u^\eta \circ T$ and $f \circ T$ by a change of variables, which leads to the result. □

Remark 3.10. Our argument gives no information or counterexample for $d = 1$. Every continuous piecewise affine function of one variable is locally shallow, so Lemma 3.8 has no one-dimensional counterpart, and tilting the walls requires a second coordinate. Hence, whether $\mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ itself is closed in $C([a, b])$ for an interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ remains open for $N \geq 2$.

Remark 3.11. Note that our argument does not prove non-closedness for deeper networks. While we believe this to be true, we leave this question open for further investigation.

Remark 3.12. Note that the construction above can be extended to an even amount of neurons $N \geq 4$ and $M \geq 6$ in a straightforward way. We believe that a similar construction makes Theorem 3.1 hold for any $N \geq 4$ and $M \geq 6$.

4 Applications

In this section, we study the consequences of Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 3.1 on multiple learning problems. We will be interested in minimizing an energy or objective function $E : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \to (-\infty, \infty]$, $1 < p \leq \infty$, which verifies:

(H1) Weak lower semicontinuity: $u^n \rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ($u^n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u$ in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$) implies $E(u) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} E(u^n)$;

(H2) Coercivity: $E(u) \to +\infty$ as $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to \infty$;

(H3) $E(0) < \infty$.

Remark 4.1. (H3) is here to ensure that E is not identically equal to ∞ on any $\mathcal{N}_N$. Since $0 \in \mathcal{N}_N$ for every N, this condition is sufficient.

A direct corollary of Theorem 2.3 is that if the energy verifies assumptions (H1)–(H3), then there is a shallow ReLU network with fixed size that minimizes the energy:

Theorem 4.2 (Existence)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, open and connected, and let $E : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \to (-\infty, \infty]$, $1 < p \leq \infty$ satisfy* (H1)*,* (H2) *and* (H3)*. Then for every $N \geq 1$,*

$$\inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_N} E(u) \quad \textit{is attained.}$$

Moreover, every minimizing sequence in $\mathcal{N}_N$ possesses a subsequence converging weakly in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ to a minimizer (weakly- in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ if $p = \infty$).*

The proof of Theorem 4.2 is a classical application of the direct method of the calculus of variations, but we recall it here for the sake of completeness:

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let $1 < p < \infty$ and let $u^n \in \mathcal{N}_N$ with $E(u^n) \to m := \inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E < \infty$. Such sequences exists by (H3). For n large, $E(u^n) \leq \max(m, 0) + 1$, so (u^n) is bounded in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ by coercivity (H2). Since $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is reflexive for $1 < p < \infty$, we can extract a subsequence (that we do not relabel) such that $u^n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. By Theorem 2.3, $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$, and by weak lower semicontinuity (H1) we have $E(u) \leq \liminf_n E(u^n) = m$. Since $E(u) > -\infty$, we get $m > -\infty$ and, as $u \in \mathcal{N}_N$, $E(u) = m$.

The same proof applies for $p = \infty$ with the weak-* convergence by applying the Banach–Alaoglu theorem. □

Remark 4.3. Theorem 2.3 holds for $p = 1$, but Theorem 4.2 does not, because bounded sequences in $W^{1,1}$ need not have weakly convergent subsequences. Consider on $W^{1,1}(0, 1)$

$$E(u) = \|u\|_{W^{1,1}} + 2\,|u(1) - u(0) - 1|.$$

It is coercive, and weakly lower semicontinuous as the sum of a norm and of the absolute value of a continuous affine functional.

With $t := u(1) - u(0)$, we have $\|u'\|_{L^1} \geq |t|$ and $|t| + 2|t - 1| \geq 1$, so $E(u) \geq \|u\|_{L^1} + 1$. Hence $E(u) > 1$ for $u \neq 0$, and $E(0) = 2$. On the other hand, the single neurons $u_n = n\,\sigma(x - 1 + \frac{1}{n})$ satisfy $E(u_n) = 1 + \frac{1}{2n}$ and, hence, are a minimizing sequence. Thus $\inf_{\mathcal{N}_1} E = \inf_{W^{1,1}} E = 1$, and this infimum is attained neither on $\mathcal{N}_1$ nor on $W^{1,1}(0, 1)$. If it was attained at some $u \in W^{1,1}(0, 1)$ or $u \in \mathcal{N}_1$, from the above we would get that $\|u\|_{L^1} = 0$ and hence $u = 0$. This implies $E(u) = 2$ which is a contradiction.

4.1 The Deep Ritz method

The Deep Ritz method [23] solves a PDE that has a variational formulation, for instance, through the Lax–Milgram or Stampacchia theorem [26], by minimizing the corresponding energy over a class of neural networks. Following [2], we consider energies of the form

$$E(u) = \int_\Omega F\big(x, u(x), \nabla u(x)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\partial\Omega} G\big(x, u(x)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x), \tag{16}$$

on a bounded, open, connected Lipschitz set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where u on $\partial\Omega$ is understood in the sense of traces. Let $1 < p < \infty$. To keep the proofs elementary, we make the following assumptions.

(D1) Convexity. For all (u,ξ), the maps $x \mapsto F(x,u,\xi)$ and $x \mapsto G(x,u)$ are measurable. For a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $(u,\xi) \mapsto F(x,u,\xi)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and for $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$-a.e. $x \in \partial\Omega$, $u \mapsto G(x,u)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}$.

(D2) Growth. $|F(x,u,\xi)| \le a(x) + C(|u|^p + |\xi|^p)$ and $|G(x,u)| \le b(x) + C|u|^p$, with $a \in L^1(\Omega)$, $b \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$ and $C \ge 0$.

(D3) Coercivity. We have

$$F(x,u,\xi) \ge c_0|\xi|^p + c_1|u|^p - h(x)|u| - a_0(x), \qquad G(x,u) \ge c_2|u|^p - b_0(x),$$

with $c_0 > 0$, $c_1, c_2 \ge 0$, $c_1 + c_2 > 0$, $h \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$, $a_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $b_0 \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$.

A finite convex function on $\mathbb{R}^m$ is continuous, so (D1) implies that F and G are Carathéodory functions. In particular, for $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, (D2) asserts that $x \mapsto F(x,u(x),\nabla u(x))$ is integrable on Ω and using the definition of the trace, $x \mapsto G(x,u(x))$ is integrable on $\partial\Omega$. Hence, $E : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ is well defined.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded, Lipschitz, open and connected set. Under (D1)–(D3),* (16) *defines a functional $E : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ which is convex, continuous, and satisfies (H1)–(H3). Hence, by Theorem 4.2, $\inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E$ is attained for every $N \ge 1$.*

Proof. First, note that (D1) implies that E is convex. Let us show that it is strongly continuous: let $u_n \to u$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. It suffices to show that every subsequence has a further subsequence along which $E(u_n) \to E(u)$. Using [26, Theorem 4.9], we may assume that there exist $h_1, h_2 \in L^p(\Omega)$ and $h_3 \in L^p(\partial\Omega)$ and a subsequence u_n such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &\to u, & |u_n| &\le h_1 & &\text{a.e. in } \Omega,\\ \nabla u_n &\to \nabla u, & |\nabla u_n| &\le h_2 & &\text{a.e. in } \Omega,\\ u_n &\to u, & |u_n| &\le h_3 & &\mathcal{H}^d\text{-a.e. on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

By continuity of F and G in (u,ξ), the integrands converge pointwise a.e. By (D2), they are dominated by

$$a + C(|h_1|^p + |h_2|^p) \quad \text{and} \quad b + C|h_3|^p,$$

which are in $L^1(\Omega)$ and in $L^1(\partial\Omega)$ respectively. The dominated convergence theorem gives $E(u_n) \to E(u)$. Consequently, E is convex, strongly continuous hence weakly lower-semicontinuous, i.e. *(H1)* holds.

By (D3) and Hölder's inequality,

$$E(u) \ge c_0\|\nabla u\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} + c_1\|u\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} + c_2\|u\|^p_{L^p(\partial\Omega)} - \|h\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)}\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} - \|a_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \|b_0\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)}.$$

If $c_1 > 0$, the first two terms bound $\min(c_0,c_1)\|u\|^p_{W^{1,p}}$ from below. If $c_1 = 0$, then $c_2 > 0$ and the Friedrichs inequality $\|u\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C_F\big(\|\nabla u\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|^p_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}\big)$ [25], valid on bounded connected Lipschitz sets, gives the same conclusion. In both cases $E(u) \ge \kappa\|u\|^p_{W^{1,p}} - \|h\|_{L^{p'}}\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} - C'$ with $\kappa > 0$, and the right-hand side tends to $+\infty$ since $p > 1$. This proves *(H2)*. □

Remark 4.5 (Weaker assumptions). Assumptions (D1)–(D3) can be relaxed considerably; for instance, convexity of F is only needed in the ξ variable [27, Chapter 7] and the boundary lower bound only needs to hold on a part $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$ of positive $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$ measure.

Example 4.6 (Robin energy)**.** Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\beta > 0$, and consider the Poisson problem with Robin boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_n u + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Its weak solution is the minimizer over $H^1(\Omega)$ of

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{\beta}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - \int_\Omega fu \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

This energy has the form (16) with $p = 2$, $F(x, u, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 - f(x)u$ and $G(x, u) = \frac{\beta}{2}u^2$. Both are convex, which gives (D1). Since $|fu| \le \frac{1}{2}f^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2$, (D2) holds with $a = \frac{1}{2}f^2$ and $b = 0$. Finally, (D3) holds with $c_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = \frac{\beta}{2}$, $h = |f|$ and $a_0 = b_0 = 0$. By Theorem 4.4, E admits a minimizer over $\mathcal{N}_N$ for every $N \ge 1$.

Formally, as $\beta \to \infty$, (17) becomes the Dirichlet problem $-\Delta u = f$ in Ω, $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Taking $\beta \gg 1$ thus corresponds to the "soft" imposition of Dirichlet boundary conditions commonly used in the Deep Ritz method.

Example 4.7 (Hard imposition of Dirichlet boundary conditions)**.** Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and consider the Poisson problem with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

Its weak solution is the minimizer over $H^1_0(\Omega)$ of

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega fu \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Let φ be as in Corollary 2.7 and set $\mathcal{V}_N = \varphi\mathcal{N}_N$. We can show that

$$\inf_{u\in\mathcal{V}_N} E(u) \quad \text{is attained.}$$

Indeed, E is convex and continuous on $H^1(\Omega)$, hence weakly lower semicontinuous. It is coercive on $H^1_0(\Omega)$: by Poincaré's inequality, $E(u) \ge \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2} - C_P\|f\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}$. A minimizing sequence in $\mathcal{V}_N \subset H^1_0(\Omega)$ is therefore bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. By Corollary 2.7, it has a subsequence converging weakly to some element of $\mathcal{V}_N$, which is a minimizer by lower semicontinuity.

Example 4.8 (Sobolev training)**.** Sobolev training [24] fits a network to both the values and the derivatives of a target. Given $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ and $g \in L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, typically $g = \nabla f$ when $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, and weights $\alpha, \gamma > 0$, consider

$$E(u) = \alpha\int_\Omega |u - f|^p \,\mathrm{d}x + \gamma\int_\Omega |\nabla u - g|^p \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{19}$$

E is of the form (16) with $F(x, u, \xi) = \alpha|u - f(x)|^p + \gamma|\xi - g(x)|^p$ and $G = 0$. Assumption (D1) is clear. The inequality $2^{1-p}|s|^p - |t|^p \le |s - t|^p \le 2^{p-1}(|s|^p + |t|^p)$ gives (D2) with $a = 2^{p-1}(\alpha|f|^p + \gamma|g|^p)$ and $C = 2^{p-1}\max(\alpha, \gamma)$, and (D3) with $c_0 = 2^{1-p}\gamma$, $c_1 = 2^{1-p}\alpha > 0$, $h = 0$ and $a_0 = \alpha|f|^p + \gamma|g|^p$. By Theorem 4.4, E admits a minimizer over $\mathcal{N}_N$ for every $N \ge 1$.

4.2 Lipschitz learning

Lipschitz learning constrains or penalizes the Lipschitz constant $\operatorname{Lip}(u) := \sup_{x\neq y\in\Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|/|x-y|$ of a classifier in order to make it robust to perturbations of the input, see, for instance, [12, 18, 21]. Throughout this subsection, every $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ is identified with its continuous representative on the open set Ω, so that $\operatorname{Lip}(u) \in [0,\infty]$ is well defined and constraints such as $0 \le u \le 1$ hold pointwise. Note that $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le \operatorname{Lip}(u)$.

We shall first discuss the binary classification problem with Lipschitz constraint. Lipschitz learning then takes the form of minimizing the following energy

$$W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \ni u \mapsto E(u) := \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{\Omega\times\{0,1\}} \ell(u(x),y)\,\mathrm{d}\rho(x,y) & \text{if } 0\le u\le 1 \text{ and } \operatorname{Lip}(u)\le L,\\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Here ρ is a probability measure on $\Omega\times\{0,1\}$ and $\ell : [0,1]^2 \to [0,\infty)$ is a loss function, continuous in its first variable.

Example 4.9 (Lipschitz learning)**.** E defined in (20) satisfies (H1)–(H3) with $p=\infty$ and hence, by Theorem 4.2, admits a minimizer in $\mathcal{N}_N$ for every $N \ge 1$. Clearly $E \ge 0 > -\infty$.

For (H1), let $u_n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u$ in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with $\liminf_{n\to\infty} E(u_n) < \infty$, so that, along a subsequence realizing the lim inf we have $u_n \in C_L$. In particular, u_n is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. Hence, by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem the continuous representatives of u_n converge locally uniformly on Ω (and hence also pointwise) to some $u \in C_L$. Thanks to the continuity of ℓ and Fatou's lemma we have

$$\int_{\Omega\times\{0,1\}} \ell(u(x),y)\,\mathrm{d}\rho(x,y) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{\Omega\times\{0,1\}} \ell(u_n(x),y)\,\mathrm{d}\rho(x,y).$$

This shows lower semicontinuity of E.

Furthermore, coercivity (H2) is immediate since, using $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le \operatorname{Lip}(u)$,

$$C_L := \big\{u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \,:\, 0\le u\le 1 \text{ and } \operatorname{Lip}(u)\le L\big\}$$

is bounded in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$.

Finally, (H3) holds since $E(0) < \infty$.

Since (20) incorporates hard constraints, it is more of academic interest and less relevant in practice. There, one usually replaces the Lipschitz bound by a penalty term and the data-fitting term with a binary cross-entropy loss composed with the softmax function which eliminates the constraint $0 \le u \le 1$. More precisely, u is now interpreted as a logit rather than a probability: Letting $s(t) := 1/(1+e^{-t})$ denote the sigmoid function, the class probabilities are $(1-s(u), s(u))$, and the loss is chosen as the cross-entropy composed with the softmax operation, i.e.,

$$\ell(u,y) := -y\log s(u) - (1-y)\log\big(1-s(u)\big), \qquad y\in\{0,1\}.$$

Since $-\log s(u) = L(-u)$ and $-\log(1-s(u)) = L(u)$ with $L(t) := \log(1+e^t)$, the energy can be written compactly as

$$E(u) := \int_{\Omega\times\{0,1\}} L((1-2y)u)\,\mathrm{d}\rho(x,y) + \lambda \operatorname{Lip}(u), \tag{21}$$

where $\lambda > 0$. Note that E takes values in $[0,\infty]$, since $\operatorname{Lip}(u)$ may be infinite.

Example 4.10 (Cross-entropy with Lipschitz penalty)**.** Assume that the unnormalized conditional distributions $\rho_i := \rho(\cdot \times \{i\})$ are not the zero measure for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Then, E defined in (21) satisfies (H1)–(H3) with $p = \infty$ and hence, by Theorem 4.2, admits a minimizer in $\mathcal{N}_N$ for every $N \geq 1$.

For (H1), if $u_n \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u$ in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ then by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem $u_n \to u$ locally uniformly, hence pointwise on Ω. Since $L \geq 0$ is continuous, Fatou's lemma gives lower semicontinuity of the cross-entropy term, and Lip is lower semicontinuous under pointwise convergence.

For (H2), define $D := \operatorname{diam}(\Omega)$. Since $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \operatorname{Lip}(u) \leq E(u)/\lambda$, it suffices to show that $E(u_n) \to \infty$ when $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty} \to \infty$ with $\operatorname{Lip}(u_n)$ bounded uniformly in n. Supoose this is not the case, meaning for such a sequence we have $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} E(u_n) < \infty$. Note that $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty} \to \infty$ together with the uniform Lipschitz continuity of u_n implies that (up to passing to a subsequence) there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ with $|u_n(x_0)| \to \infty$. Up to passing to another subsequence, we can, without loss of generality, assume that $u_n(x_0) \to \infty$ (the case $u_n(x_0) \to -\infty$ is treated symmetrically). We can use $u_n \geq u_n(x_0) - D \operatorname{Lip}(u_n)$ on Ω, $L(t) \geq t$, as well as $\rho_0(\Omega) > 0$ to get

$$E(u_n) \geq \rho_0(\Omega)\big(u_n(x_0) - D \operatorname{Lip}(u_n)\big) \to \infty, \qquad n \to \infty$$

which is a contradiction.

Finally, $E(0) = \log 2 < \infty$ which shows (H3).

4.3 Selection of minimal-norm parameters via weight decay

Theorem 4.2 guarantees that suitable energies E admit a minimizer $u^* \in \mathcal{N}_N$, but says nothing about the parameters realizing it. These are never unique: by positive homogeneity of σ, the rescaling $(a_i, w_i, b_i) \mapsto (a_i/t,\, tw_i,\, tb_i)$, $t > 0$, leaves u_θ unchanged, so u^* has parameter representations of arbitrarily large norm. A natural way to select one is to penalize the parameter norm. We show that minimizers of the penalized objective stay bounded and, as the penalty vanishes, accumulate only at minimal-norm parameter representations of minimizers of E. This is a classical instance of Tikhonov regularization [31].

Let $\mathbb{R}^P$ denote the parameter space with $P = N(d + 2) + 1$, where each parameter vector $\theta = (a_1, \ldots, a_N, w_1, \ldots, w_N, b_1, \ldots, b_N, c) \in \mathbb{R}^P$ induces a network realization $u_\theta \in \mathcal{N}_N$. Define the parameter loss $J(\theta) := E(u_\theta)$ and the weight decay regularizer $R(\theta) := \|\theta\|^2$. For $\lambda > 0$, consider the regularized objective

$$F_\lambda(\theta) := J(\theta) + \lambda R(\theta).$$

We will need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.11 (Continuity of the realization map)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and $1 \leq p < \infty$. The map $\mathbb{R}^P \ni \theta \mapsto u_\theta \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is continuous.*

Proof. Let $\theta^n \to \theta$, and write $z_i^n(x) := w_i^n \cdot x + b_i^n$ and $z_i(x) := w_i \cdot x + b_i$. By [15, Prop. 4.1], or directly because σ is 1-Lipschitz, $u_{\theta^n} \to u_\theta$ uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$, hence in $L^p(\Omega)$. By the chain rule, $\nabla u_\theta = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i\, w_i\, \mathbf{1}_{\{z_i>0\}}$ a.e. in Ω and terms with $w_i = 0$ vanish on both sides. Therefore

$$\nabla u_{\theta^n} - \nabla u_\theta = \sum_{i=1}^N \big(a_i^n w_i^n - a_i w_i\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{z_i^n>0\}} + \sum_{i:\, w_i\neq 0} a_i w_i\big(\mathbf{1}_{\{z_i^n>0\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z_i>0\}}\big).$$

The first sum tends to 0 uniformly. For the second sum, if $w_i \neq 0$, then $z_i^n \to z_i$ pointwise, so $\mathbf{1}_{\{z_i^n>0\}} \to \mathbf{1}_{\{z_i>0\}}$ outside the null set $\{z_i = 0\}$. The summands are bounded by $2|a_i||w_i|$ and Ω is bounded, so dominated convergence gives convergence in $L^p(\Omega)$. □

Proposition 4.12 (Convergence to minimal-norm parameter representations)**.** *Let $E : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \to (-\infty, \infty]$, $1 < p < \infty$, satisfy* (H1)–(H3)*.*

(i) For every $\lambda > 0$, F_λ attains its global infimum over $\mathbb{R}^P$ at some $\theta_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^P$.

(ii) The family of regularized minimizers $(\theta_\lambda)_{\lambda>0}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^P$.

(iii) Every sequence $\lambda_n \to 0^+$ admits a subsequence $(\lambda_{n_k})_k$ such that $\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}} \to \theta^\dagger$ in $\mathbb{R}^P$, where $\theta^\dagger$ is a minimal-norm optimal parameter representation:

$$J(\theta^\dagger) = \min_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^P} J(\theta) \qquad \text{and} \qquad R(\theta^\dagger) = \min\{R(\theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^P, J(\theta) = \min J\}.$$

Consequently, $u_{\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}}} \to u_{\theta^\dagger}$ strongly in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof. **Step 1: Existence of a minimal-norm minimizer.** By Theorem 4.2, the unregularized set of parameter minimizers $\Theta^* := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^P : J(\theta) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E\}$ is non-empty. Using Lemma 4.11, $\theta \mapsto u_\theta$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}^P$ into $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and E is weakly lower semicontinuous, J is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{R}^P$ and bounded from below. Thus Θ^* is a non-empty, closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^P$. Since $R(\theta) = \|\theta\|^2$ is continuous and coercive, it attains its minimum over Θ^* and we can choose $\theta^\dagger \in \arg\min_{\theta\in\Theta^*} R(\theta)$.

Step 2: Boundedness of θ_λ. Fix $\lambda > 0$. The functional F_λ is lower semicontinuous and coercive on $\mathbb{R}^P$ because J is bounded from below and $\lambda R(\theta) \to +\infty$ as $\|\theta\| \to \infty$. Hence F_λ admits a minimizer $\theta_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^P$, proving (i). By minimality of θ_λ:

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E + \lambda R(\theta_\lambda) \le J(\theta_\lambda) + \lambda R(\theta_\lambda) \le J(\theta^\dagger) + \lambda R(\theta^\dagger) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E + \lambda R(\theta^\dagger)$$

which yields $R(\theta_\lambda) \le R(\theta^\dagger)$. Thus, $\|\theta_\lambda\| \le \|\theta^\dagger\|$ for all $\lambda > 0$, establishing (ii).

Step 3: Convergence as $\lambda \to 0^+$. Let $\lambda_n \to 0^+$. By (ii) and the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem, there is a subsequence with $\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}} \to \theta^0$ for some $\theta^0 \in \mathbb{R}^P$. Lower semicontinuity of J gives

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E \le J(\theta^0) \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} J(\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}}) \le \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left(F_{\lambda_{n_k}}(\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}}) - \lambda_{n_k} R(\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}})\right) \le \inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E,$$

which implies $J(\theta^0) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_N} E$, so $\theta^0 \in \Theta^*$. Continuity of R together with Step 2 yields $R(\theta^0) = \lim_k R(\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}}) \le R(\theta^\dagger)$. By definition of $\theta^\dagger$, we conclude $R(\theta^0) = R(\theta^\dagger)$, so θ^0 is a minimal-norm parameter representation. Finally, $u_{\theta_{\lambda_{n_k}}} \to u_{\theta^0}$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ by Lemma 4.11, which proves (iii) with θ^0 in place of $\theta^\dagger$. □

4.4 Failure of existence for two hidden layers

The existence results above rely on Theorem 2.3, and therefore on the network having a single hidden layer. Theorem 3.1 shows that this restriction cannot be removed. Even for the simplest energy of Example 4.8, a coercive, convex and continuous functional on $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the infimum over networks with two hidden layers need not be attained.

For $u \in \mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ as in (10), we write $\theta = (w_e, b_e, c_{ke}, d_k, a_k, c) \in \mathbb{R}^{P'}$ for its parameters, where $P' := N(d+1) + M(N+1) + M + 1$, and u_θ for its realization on Ω.

Proposition 4.13 (Sobolev training over two hidden layers)**.** *Let $d \ge 2$, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and open, and let f be the target of Theorem 3.1. For $1 \le p < \infty$ and $\alpha, \gamma > 0$, consider the Sobolev training energy* (19) *with $g = \nabla f$, i.e.*

$$E(u) = \alpha\|u - f\|_{L^p}^p + \gamma\|\nabla u - \nabla f\|_{L^p}^p$$

Then:

(i) $\inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_{4,6}} E(u) = 0$*, and this infimum is not attained.*

(ii) Every minimizing sequence $(u_{\theta_n})_n \subset \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ *satisfies* $\|\theta_n\| \to \infty$*.*

Proof. (i). By Theorem 3.1, the networks $u^\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$ satisfy

$$E(u^\eta) \le \alpha|\Omega|\,(C\eta)^p + \gamma\, C_p\, \eta \xrightarrow[\eta\to 0]{} 0.$$

Hence the infimum is 0. If $E(u) = 0$ for some $u \in \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$, then $u = f$ a.e. in Ω. Both functions are continuous, so $u = f$ on Ω, which contradicts $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{4,6}$.

(ii). The map $(\theta, x) \mapsto u_\theta(x)$ is continuous, so $\theta \mapsto u_\theta$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}^{P'}$ into $C(\overline{\Omega})$. Suppose that $E(u_{\theta_n}) \to 0$ and that (θ_n) has a bounded subsequence. A further subsequence converges to some θ^*, and then $u_{\theta_n} \to u_{\theta^*}$ uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$. Hence $\|u_{\theta^*} - f\|_{L^p} = \lim_n \|u_{\theta_n} - f\|_{L^p} = 0$, and $u_{\theta^*} = f$ as in (i). This is a contradiction. □

Remark 4.14. The energy E is convex and continuous on $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, and coercive since $E(u) \ge \min(\alpha,\gamma)\|u - f\|^p_{W^{1,p}}$. So it satisfies (H1)–(H3), cf. Example 4.8. Thus Theorem 4.2 is false for $\mathcal{N}_{N,M}$ in place of $\mathcal{N}_N$, for every $1 < p < \infty$.

5 Discussion

In this paper, we proved that the set of ReLU neural networks with one hidden layer is closed in Sobolev spaces, and as a consequence gave existence proofs for learning methods like the Deep Ritz method or Lipschitz learning. We also disproved a conjecture by Petersen, Raslan and Voigtlaender by constructing a sequence of ReLU networks with *two* hidden layers with a limit that cannot be represented with the same number of neurons. Hence, the space of ReLU neural networks with two hidden layer is not closed, neither in Sobolev spaces not in the space of continuous functions.

Our results imply that regularization methods like weight decay are called for if one wants to ensure the existence of optimal deep neural networks, minimizing a given loss. In contrast, the special geometry of shallow ReLU networks ensures existence even without regularization.

A natural follow-up question from our results is whether learning problems with finitely many data always possess solutions (over the space of shallow or deep ReLU networks) or the study of existence of solutions for the bounded-variation-type problems that arise from adversarial training, see [1] where a weight-decay regularizer was added to ensure coercivity and existence of solutions in $\mathcal{N}_N$. Another direction could be to investigate the convergence of (stochastic) gradient descent in the context of Sobolev training or the Deep Ritz method over the space $\mathcal{N}_N$, similarly to [10].

Acknowledgment

LB acknowledges funding by the Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space of Germany (BMFTR) under grant agreement No. 16IS24072 (COMFORT) and by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), project number 544579844 (GeoMAR).

AI use disclosure

Claude Opus 5.5 was used to refine an initial draft of Theorem 2.3, which was originally written by the authors. The result stated in Theorem 3.1 is based on a counterexample initially derived entirely by Claude and subsequently refined by the authors. The remainder of the paper was

written by the authors and all AI-generated proofs were carefully reviewed, largely rewritten for clarity, and verified by the authors, who retain full responsibility for the correctness of the manuscript.

Claude was also used to improve grammar and style, as well as to perform final mathematical checks and help to create visual illustrations of the proofs.

References

[1] Yannick Lunk, Atell Yehor Krasnopolsky, Damien Garreau, and Leon Bungert. *Explaining the Saliency Map Sparsity of Adversarially-Trained Neural Networks*. 2026. arXiv: 2610.10666 [cs.LG] (cit. on p. 24).

[2] Nima Rezaei and Stephan Wojtowytsch. "The Barron–Lipschitz Energy Gap and Depth Separation Phenomena in Scientific Machine Learning". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.25905* (2026). arXiv: 2607.25905 [math.AP] (cit. on pp. 3, 18).

[3] Stephan Wojtowytsch. "Elliptic Regularity Theory in Barron Spaces and Applications to the Deep Ritz Method". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.25100* (2026). arXiv: 2607.25100 [math.NA] (cit. on p. 3).

[4] Enrique Zuazua. "The Coercivity Gap in Neural PDE Solvers: Parameter Escape and Functional Convergence". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.04018* (2026). arXiv: 2606.04018 [math.NA] (cit. on p. 3).

[5] Steffen Dereich, Arnulf Jentzen, and Sebastian Kassing. "On the Existence of Minimizers in Shallow Residual ReLU Neural Network Optimization Landscapes". In: *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 62.6 (2024), pp. 2640–2666 (cit. on p. 2).

[6] Steffen Dereich and Sebastian Kassing. "On the Existence of Optimal Shallow Feedforward Networks with ReLU Activation". In: *Journal of Machine Learning* 3.1 (2024), pp. 1–22 (cit. on pp. 2, 8).

[7] Quoc-Tung Le, Elisa Riccietti, and Rémi Gribonval. "Does a Sparse ReLU Network Training Problem Always Admit an Optimum?" In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 36. 2023 (cit. on pp. 2, 9).

[8] Steffen Dereich and Sebastian Kassing. "On minimal representations of shallow ReLU networks". In: *Neural Networks* 148 (2022), pp. 121–128 (cit. on p. 14).

[9] Patrick Dondl, Johannes Müller, and Marius Zeinhofer. "Uniform Convergence Guarantees for the Deep Ritz Method for Nonlinear Problems". In: *Advances in Continuous and Discrete Models* 2022 (2022), Paper No. 49 (cit. on p. 2).

[10] Arnulf Jentzen and Adrian Riekert. "On the Existence of Global Minima and Convergence Analyses for Gradient Descent Methods in the Training of Deep Neural Networks". In: *Journal of Machine Learning* 1.2 (2022), pp. 141–246 (cit. on pp. 2, 24).

[11] Johannes Müller and Marius Zeinhofer. "Error Estimates for the Deep Ritz Method with Boundary Penalty". In: *Proceedings of Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning*. Ed. by Bin Dong, Qianxiao Li, Lei Wang, and Zhi-Qin John Xu. Vol. 190. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022, pp. 215–230 (cit. on pp. 2, 3).

[12] Leon Bungert, René Raab, Tim Roith, Leo Schwinn, and Daniel Tenbrinck. "CLIP: Cheap Lipschitz Training of Neural Networks". In: *Scale Space and Variational Methods in Computer Vision (SSVM 2021)*. Ed. by Abderrahim Elmoataz, Jalal Fadili, Yvain Quéau, Julien Rabin, and Loïc Simon. Vol. 12679. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Cham: Springer, 2021, pp. 307–319 (cit. on pp. 2, 21).

[13] Christoph Hertrich, Amitabh Basu, Marco Di Summa, and Martin Skutella. "Towards Lower Bounds on the Depth of ReLU Neural Networks". In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 34. 2021, pp. 3336–3348 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[14] Scott Mahan, Emily J. King, and Alexander Cloninger. "Nonclosedness of Sets of Neural Networks in Sobolev Spaces". In: *Neural Networks* 137 (2021), pp. 85–96 (cit. on p. 2).

[15] Philipp Petersen, Mones Raslan, and Felix Voigtlaender. "Topological Properties of the Set of Functions Generated by Neural Networks of Fixed Size". In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 21 (2021), pp. 375–444 (cit. on pp. 2, 4, 9, 22).

[16] Ingo Gühring, Gitta Kutyniok, and Philipp Petersen. "Error Bounds for Approximations with Deep ReLU Neural Networks in $W^{s,p}$ Norms". In: *Analysis and Applications* 18.5 (2020), pp. 803–859 (cit. on p. 3).

[17] Juncai He, Lin Li, Jinchao Xu, and Chunyue Zheng. "ReLU Deep Neural Networks and Linear Finite Elements". In: *Journal of Computational Mathematics* 38.3 (2020), pp. 502–527 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[18] Vishaal Krishnan, Al Makdah, Abed AlRahman, and Fabio Pasqualetti. "Lipschitz bounds and provably robust training by Laplacian smoothing". In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 10924–10935 (cit. on pp. 2, 21).

[19] Johannes Müller and Marius Zeinhofer. "Deep Ritz Revisited". In: *ICLR 2020 Workshop on Integration of Deep Neural Models and Differential Equations*. 2020 (cit. on p. 2).

[20] Jinchao Xu. "Finite Neuron Method and Convergence Analysis". In: *Communications in Computational Physics* 28.5 (2020), pp. 1707–1745 (cit. on p. 2).

[21] Chris Finlay, Jeff Calder, Bilal Abbasi, and Adam Oberman. *Lipschitz regularized Deep Neural Networks generalize and are adversarially robust*. 2019. arXiv: `1808.09540 [cs.LG]` (cit. on pp. 2, 21).

[22] Raman Arora, Amitabh Basu, Poorya Mianjy, and Anirbit Mukherjee. "Understanding Deep Neural Networks with Rectified Linear Units". In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2018 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[23] Weinan E and Bing Yu. "The Deep Ritz Method: A Deep Learning-Based Numerical Algorithm for Solving Variational Problems". In: *Communications in Mathematics and Statistics* 6.1 (2018), pp. 1–12 (cit. on pp. 2, 18).

[24] Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Simon Osindero, Max Jaderberg, Grzegorz Swirszcz, and Razvan Pascanu. "Sobolev Training for Neural Networks". In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 30. 2017, pp. 4278–4287 (cit. on pp. 2, 20).

[25] Jindřich Nečas. *Direct Methods in the Theory of Elliptic Equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Heidelberg: Springer, 2012 (cit. on p. 19).

[26] Haim Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Universitext. New York: Springer, 2011 (cit. on pp. 18, 19).

[27] Irene Fonseca and Giovanni Leoni. *Modern Methods in the Calculus of Variations: L^p Spaces*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. New York: Springer, 2007 (cit. on p. 19).

[28] Paul C. Kainen, Věra Kůrková, and Andrew Vogt. "Best Approximation by Linear Combinations of Characteristic Functions of Half-Spaces". In: *Journal of Approximation Theory* 122.2 (2003), pp. 151–159 (cit. on p. 2).

[29] Paul C. Kainen, Věra Kůrková, and Andrew Vogt. "Best Approximation by Heaviside Perceptron Networks". In: *Neural Networks* 13.7 (2000), pp. 695–697 (cit. on p. 2).

[30] Isaac E Lagaris, Aristidis Likas, and Dimitrios I Fotiadis. "Artificial neural networks for solving ordinary and partial differential equations". In: *IEEE transactions on neural networks* 9.5 (1998), pp. 987–1000 (cit. on p. 8).

[31] Heinz W. Engl, Martin Hanke, and Andreas Neubauer. *Regularization of Inverse Problems*. Vol. 375. Mathematics and Its Applications. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996 (cit. on p. 22).

[32] Federico Girosi and Tomaso Poggio. "Networks and the Best Approximation Property". In: *Biological Cybernetics* 63.3 (1990), pp. 169–176 (cit. on p. 1).